Remarks

In the present response, claims 1-2, 7-16, 25-29, and 41-52 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 7-16, 25-28, 47, and 51-52 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication number 2002/0116480 (Muto) in view of USPN 6,735,399 (Tabb). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 1-3, 7-16, 25-28, 47, and 51-52 recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Muto in view of Tabb. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are _not_ a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art. Some examples are provided below for the independent claims.

Independent Claim 1

As one example, independent claim 1 recites attaching a memory module storing email messages to a printing device. Muto in view of Tabb does not teach or suggest this claim element.

The examiner admits that "Muto does not specifically teach method comprising a memory module storing said email messages to a printing device consumable" (see OA mailed 09/18/2008 at p. 3). The examiner also admits the following: "Neither Mutto nor Tabb specifically teaches emails being stored on a memory module" (see OA mailed 09/18/2008 at p. 5). Applicants agree with these admissions. The examiner, however, attempts to cure these deficiencies with the combination of Kinoshita. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Muto teaches a printer that includes a mail message generation unit that generates transmission data to a client apparatus or personal computer (see Muto at lines 4-9 of paragraph [0041]). The printer monitors its status and generates device status information. A status message transmission unit in the printer can transmit the information about the status of the device to a client apparatus (see Muto at paragraphs [0044] and [0045]).

Tabb teaches a Customer Replaceable Unit (CRU) or print cartridge having a memory that stores software code upgrades. The print cartridge provides software updates to the CPU of the printer. Nowhere does Tabb teach or even suggest that the print cartridge or CRU stores email messages. Instead, Tabb teaches that the print cartridge or CRU stores software code updates.

Kinoshita teaches a server that stores information about plural printers and provides this information to a user of a computer. The user then sends an e-mail with an attached file to one of the printers (the e-mail transmits from the user's computer, through an email server, and to the printer). The printer then prints the file attached to the received e-mail. Kinoshita further teaches that the printer includes a memory card for storing the received e-mail and attached file. This memory card can also store data representing connection information for connecting the printer to the mail server, a user ID, a password, an e-mail address (see Kinoshita at paragraph [0229]). The memory card of Kinoshita is not attached to a printing device consumable, such as a print cartridge. **No printing device consumable in Kinoshita stores email messages.**

The combination of Muto in view of Tabb and Kinoshita teaches a print cartridge attachable to a printer. The print cartridge has a memory that stores software code upgrades which are provided to the CPU of the printer. The printer, in turn, can transmit information about the status of the printer to a client apparatus. The printer can also receive emails with attached files that are printed at the printer. **The combination of Muto, Tabb, and Kinoshita fails to teach or even suggest that the print cartridge stores email messages.** Muto and Tabb teach that emails can be transmitted from the printer to a client, but these email messages are never stored in the print cartridge. The addition of Kinoshita teaches that the printer can receive emails with attached files that are printed. These received emails are never stored in the print cartridge. The printer can also store email information, such as email addresses, but this information is not stored in the print cartridge of the printer.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the art of record.

As another example, claim 1 recites that the email messages are uploaded from the memory module of a printing device consumable to a printing device. By way of example, emails are uploaded from a print cartridge to the printer. Muto in view of Tabb and Kinoshita does not teach or suggest this claim element.

Muto teaches a printer that includes a mail message generation unit that generates transmission data to a client apparatus or personal computer (see Muto at lines 4-9 of paragraph [0041]). The printer monitors its status and generates device status information. A status message transmission unit in the printer can transmit the information about the status of the device to a client apparatus (see Muto at paragraphs [0044] and [0045]).

Tabb teaches a print cartridge having a memory that stores software code upgrades which are provided to a printer. Nowhere does Tabb teach or even suggest that the print cartridge or CRU uploads email messages to the printer. Instead, Tabb teaches that the print cartridge or CRU stores software code updates.

Kinoshita teaches a server that stores information about plural printers and provides this information to a user of a computer. The user then sends an e-mail with an attached file to one of the printers (the e-mail transmits from the user's computer, through an email server, and to the printer). The printer then prints the file attached to the received e-mail. Kinoshita further teaches that the printer includes a memory card for storing the received e-mail and attached file. This memory card can also store data representing connection information for connecting the printer to the mail server, a user ID, a password, an e-mail address (see Kinoshita at paragraph [0229]). The memory card of Kinoshita is not attached to a printing device consumable, such as a print cartridge. **No printing device consumable in Kinoshita uploads email messages.**

The combination of Muto, Tabb, and Kinoshita teaches a print cartridge attachable to a printer. The print cartridge has a memory that stores software code upgrades which are provided to the CPU of the printer. The printer, in turn, can transmit information about the status of the printer to a client apparatus. The printer can also receive emails with attached files that are printed at the printer. **The combination of**

Muto and Tabb fails to teach or even suggest that the print cartridge uploads email messages to the printer. Muto and Tabb teach that emails can be transmitted from the printer to a client, but these email messages are never uploaded from the print cartridge to the printer. The addition of Kinoshita teaches that the printer can receive emails with attached files that are printed. These received emails are never stored in the print cartridge or uploaded from a print cartridge to the printer.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the art of record.

Independent Claim 7

As one example, independent claim 7 recites storing email messages on a memory module and then attaching the memory module to a printing device consumable. Muto in view of Tabb and Kinoshita does not teach or suggest these claim elements.

The examiner admits that "Muto does not explicitly teach storing attaching said memory modules to a printing device consumable; installing said printing device consumable with attached memory module in a printing device; and interfacing said memory module with said printing device" (see OA mailed 09/18/2008 at p. 8). The examiner also admits the following: "Neither Mutto nor Tabb specifically teaches emails being stored on a memory module" (see OA mailed 09/18/2008 at p. 9). Applicants agree with these admissions. The examiner, however, attempts to cure these deficiencies with the combination of Kinoshita. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Muto teaches a printer that includes a mail message generation unit that generates transmission data to a client apparatus or personal computer (see Muto at lines 4-9 of paragraph [0041]). The printer monitors its status and generates device status information. A status message transmission unit in the printer can transmit the information about the status of the device to a client apparatus (see Muto at paragraphs [0044] and [0045]).

13

Tabb teaches a Customer Replaceable Unit (CRU) or print cartridge having a memory that stores software code upgrades. The print cartridge provides software updates to the CPU of the printer. Nowhere does Tabb teach or even suggest that the print cartridge or CRU stores email messages. Instead, Tabb teaches that the print cartridge or CRU stores software code updates.

Kinoshita teaches a server that stores information about plural printers and provides this information to a user of a computer. The user then sends an e-mail with an attached file to one of the printers (the e-mail transmits from the user's computer, through an email server, and to the printer). The printer then prints the file attached to the received e-mail. Kinoshita further teaches that the printer includes a memory card for storing the received e-mail and attached file. This memory card can also store data representing connection information for connecting the printer to the mail server, a user ID, a password, an e-mail address (see Kinoshita at paragraph [0229]). The memory card of Kinoshita is not attached to a printing device consumable, such as a print cartridge. **No printing device consumable in Kinoshita stores email messages.**

The combination of Muto in view of Tabb and Kinoshita teaches a print cartridge attachable to a printer. The print cartridge has a memory that stores software code upgrades which are provided to the CPU of the printer. The printer, in turn, can transmit information about the status of the printer to a client apparatus. The printer can also receive emails with attached files that are printed at the printer. **The combination of Muto, Tabb, and Kinoshita fails to teach or even suggest that the print cartridge stores email messages.** Muto and Tabb teach that emails can be transmitted from the printer to a client, but these email messages are never stored in the print cartridge. The addition of Kinoshita teaches that the printer can receive emails with attached files that are printed. These received emails are never stored in the print cartridge. The printer can also store email information, such as email addresses, but this information is not stored in the print cartridge of the printer.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 7 and its dependent claims are allowable over the art of record.

Independent Claim 47

As one example, independent claim 47 recites "wherein said printing device controller is configured to access email messages in said memory module attached to said consumable, load said email messages into said printing device memory and selectively transmit said email messages using said email engine." Muto in view of Tabb and Kinoshita does not teach or suggest these claim elements.

The examiner admits that "Muto does not explicitly teach a memory module attached to a printing device consumable; a printing device memory storing said email engine; and a printing device interface disposed and configured to interface and communicate with said memory module attached to a printing device consumable supplied to said printing device" (see OA mailed 09/18/2008 at p. 18). The examiner also admits the following: "Neither Mutto nor Tabb specifically teaches emails being stored on a memory module" (see OA mailed 09/18/2008 at p. 20). Applicants agree with these admissions. The examiner, however, attempts to cure these deficiencies with the combination of Kinoshita. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Muto teaches a printer that includes a mail message generation unit that generates transmission data to a client apparatus or personal computer (see Muto at lines 4-9 of paragraph [0041]). The printer monitors its status and generates device status information. A status message transmission unit in the printer can transmit the information about the status of the device to a client apparatus (see Muto at paragraphs [0044] and [0045]).

Tabb teaches a Customer Replaceable Unit (CRU) or print cartridge having a memory that stores software code upgrades. The print cartridge provides software updates to the CPU of the printer. Nowhere does Tabb teach or even suggest that the print cartridge or CRU stores email messages. Instead, Tabb teaches that the print cartridge or CRU stores software code updates.

Kinoshita teaches a server that stores information about plural printers and provides this information to a user of a computer. The user then sends an e-mail with an

15

attached file to one of the printers (the e-mail transmits from the user's computer, through an email server, and to the printer). The printer then prints the file attached to the received e-mail. Kinoshita further teaches that the printer includes a memory card for storing the received e-mail and attached file. This memory card can also store data representing connection information for connecting the printer to the mail server, a user ID, a password, an e-mail address (see Kinoshita at paragraph [0229]). The memory card of Kinoshita is not attached to a printing device consumable, such as a print cartridge. **No printing device consumable in Kinoshita stores email messages.**

The combination of Muto in view of Tabb and Kinoshita teaches a print cartridge attachable to a printer. The print cartridge has a memory that stores software code upgrades which are provided to the CPU of the printer. The printer, in turn, can transmit information about the status of the printer to a client apparatus. The printer can also receive emails with attached files that are printed at the printer. **The combination of Muto, Tabb, and Kinoshita fails to teach or even suggest that printer access email messages stored in the print cartridge or that the printer loads emails from the print cartridge to the printer.** Muto and Tabb teach that emails can be transmitted from the printer to a client, but these email messages are never stored in the print cartridge. The addition of Kinoshita teaches that the printer can receive emails with attached files that are printed. These received emails are never stored in the print cartridge. The printer can also store email information, such as email addresses, but this information is not stored in the print cartridge of the printer.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 47 and its dependent claims are allowable over the art of record.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication number 2002/0116480 (Muto) in view of USPN 6,735,399 (Tabb) and US

16

publication number 2003/0107762 (Kinoshita) and US publication number 2002/0075500 (Kurz). This rejection is traversed.

As explained above, Muto in view of Tabb and Kinoshita fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 7. Kurz fails to cure these deficiencies. For at least these reasons, dependent claim 14 is allowable.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication number 2002/0116480 (Muto) in view of USPN 6,735,399 (Tabb) and US publication number 2003/0107762 (Kinoshita) and USPN 6,831,755 (Narushima). This rejection is traversed.

As explained above, Muto in view of Tabb and Kinoshita fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 7. Narushima fails to cure these deficiencies. For at least these reasons, dependent claim 29 is allowable.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 41, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,735,399 (Tabb) in view of US publication number 2003/0107762 (Kinoshita). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 41, 45, and 46 recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Tabb in view Kinoshita. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are _not_ a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art. Some examples are provided below for the independent claim 41.

Independent claim 41 recites a memory module attached to a printing device consumable, and email messages stored on the memory module. Tabb in view Kinoshita does not teach or suggest this claim element.

The examiner _admits_ that "Tabb does not specifically teach emails being stored on a memory module" (see OA mailed 09/18/2008 at p. 26). Applicants agree with these admissions. The examiner, however, attempts to cure these deficiencies with the combination of Kinoshita. Applicants respectfully traverse.

17

Tabb teaches a Customer Replaceable Unit (CRU) or print cartridge having a memory that stores software code upgrades. The print cartridge provides software updates to the CPU of the printer. Nowhere does Tabb teach or even suggest that the print cartridge or CRU <u>stores email messages</u>. Instead, Tabb teaches that the print cartridge or CRU stores software code updates.

Kinoshita teaches a server that stores information about plural printers and provides this information to a user of a computer. The user then sends an e-mail with an attached file to one of the printers (the e-mail transmits from the user's computer, through an email server, and to the printer). The printer then prints the file attached to the received e-mail. Kinoshita further teaches that the printer includes a memory card for storing the received e-mail and attached file. This memory card can also store data representing connection information for connecting the printer to the mail server, a user ID, a password, an e-mail address (see Kinoshita at paragraph [0229]). The memory card of Kinoshita is <u>not</u> attached to a printing device consumable, such as a print cartridge. **No printing device consumable in Kinoshita stores email messages.**

The combination of Tabb and Kinoshita teaches a print cartridge having a memory that stores software code upgrades which are provided to the CPU of the printer. The printer can receive emails with attached files that are printed at the printer. **The combination of Tabb and Kinoshita fails to teach or even suggest that the <u>print cartridge</u> stores email messages.** Kinoshita teaches that the printer can receive emails with attached files that are printed. These received emails are never stored in the print cartridge. The printer can also store email information, such as email addresses, but this information is not stored in the print cartridge of the printer.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are <u>not</u> a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 41 and its dependent claims are allowable over the art of record.

18

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 42 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,735,399 (Tabb) in view of US publication number 2003/0107762 (Kinoshita) and US publication number 2003/0214546 (Hatasa). This rejection is traversed.

As explained above, Tabb in view of Kinoshita fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 41. Hatasa fails to cure these deficiencies. For at least these reasons, dependent claim 42 is allowable.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,735,399 (Tabb) in view of US publication number 2003/0107762 (Kinoshita) and US publication number 2003/0214546 (Hatasa) and USPN 6,532,351 (Richards). These rejections are traversed.

As explained above, Tabb in view of Kinoshita fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 41. Hatasa and Richards fail to cure these deficiencies. For at least these reasons, dependent claims 43 and 44 are allowable.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication number 2002/0116480 (Muto) in view of USPN 6,735,399 (Tabb) and US publication number 2003/0107762 (Kinoshita) and US publication number 2003/0214546 (Hatasa). This rejection is traversed.

As explained above, Muto in view of Tabb and Kinoshita fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 47. Hatasa fails to cure these deficiencies. For at least these reasons, dependent claim 48 is allowable.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication number 2002/0116480 (Muto) in view of USPN 6,735,399 (Tabb) and US publication number 2003/0107762 (Kinoshita) and US publication number 2003/0214546 (Hatasa) and USPN 6,532,351 (Richards). This rejection is traversed.

As explained above, Muto in view of Tabb and Kinoshita fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 47. Hatasa and Richards fail to cure these deficiencies. For at least these reasons, dependent claims 49 and 50 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529

21